



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,662	01/31/2002	Uwe Hansmann	DE920000079US1	1472
877	7590	10/19/2004	EXAMINER	
IBM CORPORATION, T.J. WATSON RESEARCH CENTER P.O. BOX 218 YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598			DEBERADINIS, ROBERT L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2836	

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/683,662	HANSMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner Robert DeBerardinis	Art Unit 2836	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 15 April 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

The reply filed 7/22/04 consists of amending claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, addition of new claims 17, 18 and remarks related to rejection of claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 7/22/04, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 under MISCHENKO have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of ANDERSON.

Applicant argues LEVESQUE is a technically deficient reference because it has a Feb. 19, 2002 issue date and the Applicant's application has a January 31, 2002 filing date. The Applicant is correct the issue date for the LEVESQUE patent is Feb. 19, 2002 however the filing date for LEVESQUE patent is April 14, 1998.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HART 6,549,968 in view of ANDERSON 5,913,926.

Regarding claim 1.

HART discloses a mobile data processing device (notebook computer).

HART does not disclose the device to have a port for connecting an external power supply and a further port for providing power to another mobile data processing device.

ANDERSON discloses a plurality of substantially identically vertically stacked storage devices wherein each storage device includes a port for connecting an external power supply and a further port for providing power to another storage device (column 9, lines 41-44).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of this invention to modify the mobile data processor (notebook computer) to include a further port. The motivation would be to supply power to an expandable data storage array when the notebook computer power from an external power source.

Claims 2-7, 12, 13, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HART 6,549,968 in view of ANDERSON 5,913,926 in further view of LEVESQUE 6,348,744.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 4, 12, 16.

HART in view of ANDERSON discloses the data processing device according to claim 1.

HART in view of ANDERSON does not disclose a reference voltage required by said another mobile data processing device.

LEVESQUE discloses an integrated power management module wherein a data register for the DC/DC converter allows the output voltage of the DC/DC converter to be programmed via the communications interface (column 9, lines 29-35). The interface 100 receives power from the output V6 can supply two different voltages (column 8, lines 29-33)

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of this invention to modify the mobile data processor module to include an integrated power management module. The motivation would be to provide an integration power management module that provides the means for another processing device to select the output voltage provided to another processing device connected to the further port.

Regarding claims 5, 6, 13

HART in view of ANDERSON in further view of LEVESQUE disclose the mobile data processing device according to claim 4 wherein said MD PS further comprises an input for providing power from a power subsystem.

HART in view of ANDERSON in further view of LEVESQUE does not disclose battery charger of said power supplying device and a switch for controlling supply of said power from said power subsystem and battery charger to said power receiving mobile device.

The Examiner takes official notice. The process of charging a battery from a power subsystem is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to modify the integrated power management module to include a battery charger. The motivation would be to provide the means to charge the battery in the mobile power device when a power subsystem is available.

Regarding claim 7.

LEVESQUE discloses wherein said voltage generator supports several independent voltage regulator circuitries concurrently (see figure 4, 42).

Claims 8-11,14, 15, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over HART 6,549,968 in view of ANDERSON 5,913,926 in further view of LEVESQUE 6,348,744 in further view of MALONEY 5,907,464.

Regarding claims 8, 15, 17.

HART in view of ANDERSON in further view of LEVESQUE discloses the mobile data processing device according to claim 7.

HART in view of ANDERSON in further view of LEVESQUE does not disclose wherein said MD PS further comprises a protection circuit for protection of said MD PS against high voltages or statically discharges applied to said output.

MALONEY discloses ESD protection circuit coupled to power supply node to protect power supply node from high voltage (abstract).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of this invention to modify the power supply outputs of the integrated power management module to include the ESD protection circuitry. The motivation would be to protect the output power nodes from high voltage discharge.

Regarding claims 9, 14.

HART in view of ANDERSON in further view of LEVESQUE in further view of MALONEY discloses the mobile data processing device according to claim 8.

HART in view of ANDERSON in further view of LEVESQUE in further view of MALONEY does not disclose an independent protection circuit.

LEVESQUE discloses independent voltage regulator circuits having independent outputs.

MALONY discloses ESD protection circuit.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of this invention to modify the integrated power management module to include independent protection circuits. The motivation would be to protect each of the independent output nodes of the power management module.

Regarding claims 10, 11.

HART in view of ANDERSON in further view of LEVESQUE in further view of MALONEY discloses the mobile data processing device according to claim 9.

LEVESQUE discloses power management system for a portable phone (abstract).

HART discloses a notebook computer that mates to a docking station to take advantage of peripherals coupled to the docking station (column 1, lines 10-15).

Claims 18, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DEHNEL 5,382893 in view of ANDERSON 5,913,926.

Regarding claim 18.

DEHNEL discloses an AC adapter converts AC line voltage to DC voltage to provide regulated power to various electronic devices (column 1, line 12-14).

DEHNEL does not disclose a primary port that receives power from the external power supply through said external power supply adapter to a primary mobile processing device and at least one supplemental port that provides regulated power to at least one other mobile processing device.

ANDERSON discloses a plurality of substantially identically vertically stacked storage devices wherein each storage device includes a port for connecting an external power supply and a further port for providing power to another storage device (column 9, lines 41-44).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of this invention to modify the AC adapter to include a primary port and a supplemental port. The motivation would be to connect a plurality of modules in an expandable modular processing system.

Regarding claim 19.

Anderson discloses wherein said power server device is contained within a housing of an electronic device (data processing device). (column 1, lines 58-65)

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert L. DeBerardinis whose number is (571) 272-2049. The Examiner can normally be reached Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus, can be reached on (571) 272-2058. The Fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

RLD

OCTOBER 15, 2004



ROBERT L. DEBERARDINIS
PRIMARY EXAMINER